REMARKS

This is a response to the office action issued Dec. 19, 2006. Claim 21 was objected to and claims 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herle et al. in view of Ross and Wilson et al.

The applicant has amended to claims to overcome the examiner's objections as to antecedent basis.

As to the obviousness rejections, Herle et al. do not teach a system where a telephone service provider locates a mobile telephone handset upon accepting a request from a consumer to locate a particular mobile telephone handset if allowed by the user. Rather Herle et al. teach an apparatus for transferring geographic location information associated with a mobile station to a server (Herle [0007]). The apparatus of Herle establishes a secure connection with the server over a wireless network [Herle [0008]). Herle et al. do not teach the handset user being able to block location information; rather they teach away from the applicant's invention by requiring that a request received from the requester at the server contain a proper decryption key (Herle [0044]). The responsibility allowance or rejection of the request is put onto the

requester (by having the right key) rather than the handset user.

Herle et al. also do not teach returning mobile telephone handset location to the consumer in relational form by written description and shown on a map. While Ross teaches returning graphs or maps of geographic areas in which mobile devices have been located, movement trends, or other behavioral patterns of mobile uses, Ross does not teach returning data in relational form (for example, the corner of 5th and Grand Streets). Ross discusses reducing data to a more usable form (Ross [0029]); however, Ross fails to disclose what that usable form is. The closest Ross comes is to say the "The location server generates a graph from the location information for each mobile user and defines one or more regions from the graph. Each region represents a geographic area in which the corresponding mobile device has been located." (Ross [0024]). This is not in relational form. Therefore Ross combined with Herle fails to teach or suggest presenting location data in relational form.

Herle and Ross do not teach a <u>particular consumer, by sending a predetermined message</u> to the telephone service provider, can cause said telephone service provider to

locate the mobile telephone handset even when the handset owner has blocked location of the mobile telephone handset. Wilson teaches a list of friends from whom invisibility can never be withdrawn (Wilson [0120]), becoming invisible to certain friends and not others (Wilson [0156]), becoming invisible to every friend (Wilson [0157]), or becoming invisible at certain times (Wilson [0158]). Wilson does not teach or suggest sending a predetermined message to override invisibility. Thus Wilson teaches away from the applicant's invention.

Thus even combining Herle, Ross and Wilson, the applicant's invention of providing relational information about a handset location to a consumer with the ability to block location with an action performed directly on the handset, and where, with a predetermined message, the consumer can override that blocking is not taught or suggested.

For these reasons, the examiner will find that the claims are now allowable. The examiner if respectfully requested to place the case in condition for allowance at her earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted

Clifford Kraft

Clifford H. Kraft
Reg. No. 35,229
Attorney of Record

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

Clifford H. Kraft
320 Robin Hill Dr.
Naperville, IL 60540

708 528-9092 tel.

This paper is being submitted by United States First Class Mail with sufficient postage addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 by:

Signature: Clifford Kraft

Name: Clifford H. Kraft

Date: MARCH 19, 2007